

# **Dissolution of the United States of America**

by Daniel Sperling

Copyright © 2019 by Daniel Sperling

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.



This book discusses potential dissolution of our great nation. Few scenarios examined.



## **Scenario 1**

Joel Silverman

I. Secession of the BIG FOUR: California, Texas, Florida, and New York

II. Restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom, creation of an Alliance of Free Territories between Hawaii, US Territories, and Florida.

III. Invasion and occupation of Washington City by an alliance of the BIG FOUR.

IV. Annexations by the BIG FOUR

a) Nevada, Utah, and Arizona annexed into the Republic of California.

b) Oklahoma, New Mexico, and parts of Colorado annexed into the Republic of Texas.

c) Historical West Florida (parts of Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi) annexed into the Kingdom of Florida.

d) Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Jersey are ceded to Kingdom of New York.

VI. Establishment of the Kingdom of Cascadia by partion of British Columbia from Canada and the consolidation of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho from USA. Also ceding of Alaska, Northwest Territory, and Yukon Territory.

VII. Final Partioning of the union by the BIG FOUR.

a) Kingdom of Louisiana - under the influence of Florida and Texas comprised of: Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, upstate

Michigan, Nebraska, Wyoming, parts of Colorado, Montana, Iowa, North and South Dakota.

b) Kingdom of Carolina under influence of Texas comprised of: Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

c) Commonwealth of Pennsylvania under influence of New York comprised of: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Lower Michigan.

Resulting Divisions: Republic of California, Republic of Texas, Kingdom of New York, Kingdom of Florida, Kingdom of Cascadia, Kingdom of Louisiana, Kingdom of Carolina, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Kingdom of Hawaii^, Protectorate of Washington City, and the Union of Free Territories (created from all former US Territories and dependencies).

## **Scenario 2:**

David Linberg

I wouldn't expect this to happen any time soon, but from a socio-economic perspective there are perhaps three potential scenarios for the dissolution of the United States as we know it in my opinion:-

(1) Wealth Distribution - There are states that generate enough wealth to justify them being independent countries in their own right, for example California would still be in the world top 10 for national GDP. However, some of the Southern states and, particularly, the Midwest are becoming increasingly disconnected and subsidised by the wealthy states. The gap is increasing and potentially there may become a point where states or regions are no longer willing to allow their wealth to be distributed to subsidize poorer performing areas.

(2) Water distribution - The Southwest United States in particular is facing acute water shortages in the coming decades, so acute, that either this will hit the area economically or diverting water from other areas will have a significant ecological impact on another part of the country. As the problem gets worse, water becomes currency & therefore power. Do you want to give away your water or sell it to your wealthy neighbour?

(3) Ethnic Balance - The Hispanic population is increasing at a far faster rate than any other group, fertility rates in this group are approximately 2.4 as opposed to 1.8 for white non Hispanic, in fact the point of "Minority Majority" is estimated to occur in 2042, the point at which the Hispanics will be the largest ethnic group. This is neither a good or bad thing, similar patterns are seen in Europe where the fertility rates in the UK, Germany and France are significantly lower than the 2.1 replacement needed. However, Hispanic groups are not that well represented and in addition the social spread does not appear to be even across the country & there could become a point where social groups aspire for separation from each other in different parts of the country.



Ultimately, this is only speculation - the USA does not have the historic divisions of its European cousins whereby formally autonomous states that have been part of a Union for many centuries such as Britain, France and Spain now crave for that identity, this simply hasn't or can't occur in the USA.

But the world is changing, the USA's spectacular wealth, Pax Americana and its predominant position in world diplomacy have a significant power of unification as do a common language and common values. However, there are dangerous signs, Wealth distribution has never been more uneven, the world balance has changed with the emergence of China and now India, terrorism is a modern sinister threat; the world is changing.

### **Scenario 3:**

Daniel Steinberg

The Dissolution of the United States occurred in 2085, after two decades of political instability in a world increasingly dominated by the Chinese Union. The United States had been embroiled in the War for Nicaragua against the Soviet Union from 2080 to 2083, and conceded defeat in 2083, in the Managua Peace Accords in Managua, Guatemala. The United States had been heavily bombed from Chinese bases in Cuba and British Columbia. After the war, various groups rose up against central government authority and demanded increased State control of Federal Policy.

#### **State's Rights**

In 2084, U.S. President Walter Mondale reluctantly passed the State's Rights Bill in Congress increasingly opposed to the warfare against the Soviet Union. The Bill included, among other things, the requirement that declarations of war required both Congressional and State Legislative majority approval in all houses. Another clause state that, if the state saw itself threatened by the Federal Government, it had every right to secede from the Union.

Mondale, was acting under public pressure during the signing of the act, was having to deal with the massive anti-federal opinion in the United States, increased substantially by the entry into the War in Nicaragua by the previous President, Ronald Reagan. Mondale had overcome Reagan in the 2084 elections, and pledged to make peace with the Soviet Union.

However, in June 2085, Soviet Premier Vyacheslav Molotov announced that, to counter any form of United States assertiveness in international affairs, the Soviet Union would be placing nuclear missile silos in British Columbia, Cuba, and Hawaii. Mondale responded, issuing a statement that proclaimed that "In the case

that this plan comes to fruition, the United States will have no choice to respond with military action."

It was Mondale's critical announcement that sparked the final blow to an already suffering Union. Public backlash was severely against the prospect of another lost war against a Soviet Union that was becoming the foremost military power on earth. The Union finally began to fall when Governor of Washington State, John Spellman, declared that "Washington State has constantly been driven to ruin due to the warmongering policies of the federal government. The time has come to restore the true ideals of George Washington, and secede from this bastardization of his principles."

After Spellman's declaration, several state governors followed suit, such as George Wallace in Alabama, George Deukmejian in California, Mario Cuomo in New York, and Bill Clements in Texas. Mondale did not deploy the military in any of these states, citing the fact that it was a legal right of the states to do so.

On August 19, 2085, the final nail was placed in the coffin of American unionism: Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and Missouri banded together and proclaimed the re-establishment of the Confederate States of America. Simultaneously, Mondale was killed by extremists proclaiming loyalty to Secretary of State Alexander Haig, although Haig himself denied involvement.

On September 4th, 2085, the U.S. Congress met for the final time, and declared the United States dissolved. The country balkanized soon afterwards.

Seriously irreconcilable differences and very deep social and political divisions argue strongly in favor of at least contemplating the prospect of dissolving the United States with the prospect that states can form regional or ideological federations which are practically and ideologically more compatible than the current union.

## **Scenario 4:**

Judy David

Is it time to face the music, throw in the towel, and admit that our differences are just too serious and too irreconcilable and that the social and political divisions are just too deep, too broad and too many?

Is it maybe time for the individual states or at least groups of like minded states to go their own way?

Is the current union of states more of a hindrance than a help? Is it in fact preventing states from forming a more perfect union?

Are we settling for mediocre when we can have much better?

It may well be too soon to take such a draconian step — it is, but it may also be time to start thinking about it.

If nothing else, thinking about the ramifications of dissolution may inspire us to find a way forward within the existing constitutional framework.

To be clear, this is only a preliminary proposal to be contemplated and discussed, not a formal proposal for immediate action.

Just a thought experiment at this stage

To be super clear, this is not a proposal for immediate for near-term action, but simply a thought experiment, designed to inspire people to think through more clearly what they really want from government and society as a whole.

Revolution?

No, this is not a proposal for a popular revolt or uprising against the government.

Rather, this is a proposal for a voluntary, consensual, legal, and constitutional decision and process to reverse the voluntary decision that formed the United States as a monolithic constitutional republic back in 1789.

But definitely not a revolution.  
Manifesto?

Not quite. Not yet. A manifesto would be a call to action while this modest proposal is simply a call to thinking.  
Why do it?

The goal is not simply to avoid current pain in governance, but to get to a place that is more amenable to cooperation and compromise, and a greater sense of social harmony.

It should not be about getting away from something but about moving towards something that we really want.

The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence, or so it always seems, until you get there.

We need to think long and hard about whether we risk giving up something that may actually be a lot better than we think it is, all in the name of something largely unknown that we imagine might be better.

The bottom line is that we should only do it if after long and hard reflection we believe that we don't have an attractive path forward in the current federal constitutional arrangement.

Key benefit: Better representation

The simple fact is that the U.S. is now too big for individual citizens and their elected representatives in Congress to have any sort of sane, human relationship. At a ratio of 700,000 to 1, how can citizens and their Representatives relate at all?

The simple fact is that the federal government in Washington now feels far too distant and too alien to the interests of average citizens.

Once the U.S. is dissolved, citizens will have a much closer relationship to their elected representatives in their new national, state-level governments. And those representatives will have a much closer relationship to their constituents. A solid win-win.

Citizens will transition from a sense of powerlessness to a sense of pride, empowerment, investment, and commitment to their government.

Better representation will probably be the primary benefit of dissolution.  
Are we maybe simply just going through a rough patch?

We especially have to be cautious to assess whether we might simply be going through a rough patch that will resolve itself within a relatively small number of years.

But since we've already been struggling for more than a few years, it would appear that we've completed that due diligence already.

Is dissolution really necessary?

Ultimately, the question is simply whether the vast majority of Americans find it satisfying to have the kind of nation we have now, have had, and are likely to have in the decades to come.

If the people, average citizens, still have real hope, then they should stick with it. If not... dissolve and reorganize.

How large a majority would be needed to justify considering dissolution?

51%? No, still too many strong big disagreements, even over dissolution.

60? No, not really still. Plenty of unrest, but still plenty of people in favor of staying United.

66%? Eh, getting there, but still not quite there. Probably an indication that things will only get worse; the remaining one out of three will likely wither under the unrest.

90%? Certainly plenty good enough to conclude that enough is enough.

80%? Seems certainly good enough as well. One out of every five Americans is not much of a union.

75%? Seems to be the potential sweet spot for dissolution. If only one out of every four Americans wants to remain united, that is a fairly clear indication that united is not standing anymore.

Fanatic right and left wingers still harbor aspirations of dominance

The main sticking point right now may simply be that the more fanatic right and left wingers still harbor fantasies that they could prevail and dominate over everybody else. Is this a rational belief? Probably not, but these guys are not known for their pragmatism.

It may take a bunch more election cycles before the fanatics run out of steam and their supporters finally lose all faith. Not that they will ever give up, but at least it will become clear to everybody else that united neither works anymore nor is likely to ever work again.

Alternatives?

That's the problem, there are no serious alternatives under discussion. Just fantasies of one side winning over the other, which doesn't bridge or eliminate any divides.

My alternative: Split the two parties

In another paper I will elaborate my own proposal to at least partially resolve at least one effect of the political divide: split both the Democratic and Republican

parties into two separate parties, so that we have four main parties so that voters and politicians can feel more satisfied and excited with their chosen party.

We'd have:

Center Left. Moderate Democrats.

Center Right. Moderate Republicans.

Far Left. Most progressive of Democrats.

Far Right. Most conservative of Republicans.

As a general proposition none of the four would be able to win an absolute majority of anything, House, Senate, President, or even a majority of states.

The result would be a shifting coalition. Hopefully, most of the time a coalition of the two center parties, but occasionally either the Democrats or the Republicans would find common cause, at least for a single election cycle.

More details, such as how to deal with the Electoral College and presidential elections will be in that paper.

But, even that admittedly extreme proposal would still not heal or significantly lessen the angst of many of the various social and political divides that plague the country. It might be a decent stopgap, but ultimately, dissolution may be the only way forward.

Alternative: Generational change

As hardened as the various positions, ideologies, and divides are today, in no more than 50 to 75 years all of the antagonists will be long-dead and buried or at least out of power, and there is no way to predict what the next two or three generations will bring.

There is always hope.



The flip side is that the next few generations could have even worse divides and conflicts.

Could technology be the answer?

The Internet was touted as being able to bridge and cure all manner of social and political ills. So far, it hasn't worked out that way.

Still, there is always hope.

We haven't proved that technology can't solve and cure the divides. All we know is that what we have tried hasn't worked.

I won't hold out technology as some ultimate cure-all, but I won't completely write it off entirely either.

What we need is some very serious creativity.

Too often, technology has been all about the technology and fanciful notions of harmony and utopias, completely disconnected from any serious attempt to deeply comprehend the roots of the various divides and underlying social problems.

A solution in search of a problem, with no credible comprehension of the problem.

Even worse, too often technology is being used to find new ways to win in a partisan manner, which only helps to worsen the divides, not make them better or go away.

Strength of sovereign states in America

Unlike most other countries, individual states are truly sovereign and fairly independent, each with fairly robust state governments. And in fact each state in the United States has its own constitution, and most laws are state laws as well.

For most other countries a breakup would be fatal and complete chaos, but for the states of the United States, a breakup would be merely challenging, but not an existential threat.

So, for the states in America, the point is not that we have no choice but to stay united, but that it is a choice that we should consciously affirm rather than feel compelled by.

Should dissolution be a popular vote or vote of states?

Americans are of two minds on this matter, many who favor of a national popular vote, and many who favor sovereignty of the states. One person one vote versus one state one vote.

In truth, that split alone argues for dissolution, allowing the states to then reorganize themselves so that the vast majority of any new country are for the most part on the same page, which we currently are not.

As things sit, changes to the Constitution require a 3/4 consensus of states, which is now exceedingly unlikely, except maybe for this proposed dissolution of the union.

There are more than enough smaller states who don't want to see California and New York exercise veto authority over their future with a pure popular vote.

Maybe the correct answer to the question is that both a popular vote and state vote should be needed before dissolution proceeds. But as things stand, the 3/4 of states voting for constitutional changes is right way to go.

Polls

Even if a popular vote is not in the cards, polls would certainly be helpful. They could guide state politicians and potential state politicians seeking office to give them a sense of political sentiment either for dissolution or staying the course, or some as yet unknown new way.

Amendments to enable changes to the union

Right now, once a state is admitted, it is in the union forever, whether it or anybody else likes it or not.

As things stand, there is no way to dissolve the union according to the constitution.

Was the Civil War the right thing to do? It's debatable, but there was no clear process to do anything else at the time.

Currently, the Constitution provides for:

- Admission of new states.

- Division of an existing state.

- Combination of existing states.

As per the Admissions Clause:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new States shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

Breaking that apart to highlight the specific provisions:

- New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union;
- but no new States shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State;

- nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

And that last provision covers several possibilities:

Junction of two or more States

Junction of two or more parts of States

Junction of a State, and a part of a State

Junction of a State, and parts of two or more States

Junction of two or more States, and a part of a State

Junction of two or more States, and parts of two or more States

To be clear, the one way of forming a new state that is currently prohibited is to create a new state solely from a part of an existing state:

but no new States shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State;

I propose some common sense amendments to provide more flexibility in changes to the union:

Define the process for how a state can voluntarily secede on good terms with consent of the union.

Define the process for how a state can be divided into more than one state.

Define the process for how a state can voluntarily secede without consent of the union.

Define the process by which a state can be involuntarily expelled (forced to secede) from the union.

Define the process by which the constitution and union can be dissolved completely.

Technically, the latter could be achieved by each state voluntarily seceding, after first expelling any states which might decline to voluntarily secede, but a clean process for complete dissolution makes more sense, I think.

Secession vs. territory

Normally it is a U.S. territory that seeks to gain statehood (accession), but secession would be more than simply reversal of the statehood accession process.

The goal is not to revert to being a U.S. territory, but to become completely independent of the U.S.

The one exception to date was Texas, which declared independence from Mexico and then acceded to U.S. statehood directly from an independent republic. It was never a U.S. territory.

I suppose, in theory, a state might wish to simply revert from statehood to territory status, so maybe that should be permitted under the amended constitution, although that is not being sought by this proposal.

Technically, states in the United States are still sovereign, while U.S. territories are not technically sovereign.

Secession from the U.S. would simply be a somewhat different form of accession to statehood. In international law, accession to statehood is how a new country gains its independence, statehood referring to true, full sovereignty in international law, not the U.S. concept of a quasi-sovereign region within the country.

U.S. states have a hybrid form of sovereignty, being generally independent except to the degree that they defer to the federal government.

In this paper I'll refer to the full sovereignty of an independent state which is an independent country.

Is 3/4 the right threshold for statehood changes?

This paper doesn't propose or take a position on whether 3/4 is the proper threshold vote for making changes to the status on statehood for an area. Would 3/4 be the right threshold for dissolving the union or should it be unanimous?

Personally, I'm okay with either keeping the threshold at 3/4 or raising it to absolute unanimity for how many states would need to vote to dissolve the union.

What if there are one or two holdout states?

I don't think it would be fair to hold all of the other states hostage to the will of just a couple of states.

On the the hand, by passing the proposed amendment to permit individual states to be expelled out of the union, a small number of holdouts could first be expelled and then the remaining states would have a unanimous consensus.

Either way, it would really amount to the same thing.  
What would the Founding Fathers say?

The Founding Fathers might be appalled and certainly disappointed that all their good work has come to our current sorry state of affairs. Such high hopes. Dashed.

They would probably look at all of our social and political divides and ask: Who are these people?

In truth, the Founding Fathers understood division all too well with divisions of their own and warned of factions, but here we are reveling in the kinds of factions that they warned us of.

I wonder what they would have said as the union began to unravel under the divisiveness of slavery in the 1820's and what they would have thought about the Civil War and its aftermath. Did that work out as they would have hoped?

Certainly they would urge us to not give up just yet, urging us to lean on a combination of trying harder to work out our conflicts and giving the situation more time for false passions to dissipate of their own accord.

Draft a Declaration of Dependence

I think the best the Founding Fathers could do would be to ask us to contemplate drafting a new document, a Declaration of Dependence, trying to see how committed we really are to this federal union that we currently have. If we are deeply committed to our dependence on each other, then we can eventually work things out, but if we can't muster the resolve and passionate commitment to dependence, maybe independence is the road we must travel.

Whose democracy? Mine or yours?

Seriously, there are so many conflicts between values and priorities that there is no longer a consensus as to what our values really are.

We have multiple, competing, overlapping democracies at this stage. And different conceptions about the nature of democracy itself.

Shared values?

The set of values that are universally shared in the U.S. is now almost nonexistent.

Even the traditional creed of All men are created equal is a matter of dispute.

Part of the suggested Declaration of Dependence should be a clear declaration of shared values. I remain concerned whether that would even be possible at this stage, but the exercise of trying to produce such a documented list of shared values would at least validate whether or not the future of the existing union is still feasible.

Review and renewal of the social contract

The U.S. republic has been around for so long that people alive today are very far removed from the social, political, economic, and moral climate that existed at the time the country was founded. The social contract that made sense in 1776 is not necessarily the social contract that people assume and desire is in force today.

The mere fact that most of the social contract is informal and implied rather than an explicit document is itself part of the problem today. Many people assume many

elements of the social contract, even though they are not in writing. The Declaration of Independence, U.S. Constitution, and statutory law have some of the elements in writing, but even there many of the principles are implied rather than explicit principles. So much of the social contract is mere folklore or embedded in partisan party platforms or social commentary and academic treatises.

At a minimum, we, the people, all of the people, need to review the existing social contract and either affirm that the overwhelming consensus of citizens are passionately committed to it, or scrap it and replace it with a revised social contract that people alive today can passionately commit to.

The suggested Declaration of Dependence would be a much better form for the social contract than what we have today.

My conjecture is that there are too many deep and broad social, political, economic, and moral divides to either affirm the existing social contract or to devise a new social contract that everyone across all 50 states can commit to.

Yes, we absolutely should commit to the review process as a due diligence exercise before seriously considering dissolution, but I strongly suspect that the process would fail to reach a solid consensus in favor of continuing the current union and its implied social contract.

But since each of the divided states or whatever federations they wish to form will each need its own fresh, new social contract the review and renewal process will not be for naught in any case.

Common cause, common enemy?

Traditionally, a diverse people would come together because they had some very significant common cause, such as a common enemy.

9/11 seemed to give us a common enemy, but now even the simple term radical Islamic terror is a cause for division rather than unity.



How ironic — the fact that we have no great enemies should be a great relief, but instead it means that we have no reason to come together.

Revert to the old Articles of Confederation?

The simplest thing to do to dissolve the union would be to revert to the old Articles of Confederation that was in force before we adopted the U.S. Constitution.

Of course, the Articles were in fact problematic, which was why we adopted the Constitution.

But things have changed dramatically since that time. The Articles were originally proposed in 1777, ratified in 1783, and ended in 1789 when the Constitution was adopted.

Of course, it wouldn't be necessary to revert to the exact same Articles, but that would be a starting point for discussion.

I expect that a variety of relatively strong regional federations would become the norm after dissolution, so that relatively weak Articles of Confederation might be perfectly acceptable at the federal level.

In short, there are four alternatives:

- Revert to the former Articles, as they were.

- Revert to a weakened form of the former articles.

- Revert to a stronger form of the former articles.

- Dissolve without any common federation other than any new regional or ideological federations.

Now or wait?

This paper does not take a position that dissolution of the United States should be pursued at this time or in the very near future.

Later, maybe, but not right now.

We still have plenty of runway to work things out and resolve our differences.

That said, there is no good reason to wait if people have absolutely no commitment to preserving the union.

We should see if we can work out a Declaration of Dependence first, before making any rash moves.

At least another two election cycles?

This paper does take the position that waiting for at least another two presidential election cycles would be a good cooling off/work it out period.

The 2020 and 2024 election cycles should give us a lot more perspective on the severity of the divides facing this country.

By the midterm election of 2026 it should be very, very clear whether resolution is viable and near at hand or... beyond all hope.

What happens to the U.S. dollar?

Some sort of common currency union is possible and likely, although each state would certainly be free to begin issuing its own currency.

It is also possible that a common monetary union, based on the Federal Reserve could be maintained even after dissolution, whether for all states or any subset of states that opted for it.

Or different groups of states could have smaller monetary compacts.

Who gets the money?

Some sort of proportional divide, probably based on population makes the most sense for how to divvy up the cash held by the Federal Reserve.

Who gets the debt?

Some sort of proportional divide, probably based on population makes the most sense for how to divvy up the federal debt.

Might a state decide to disown that debt, especially if the majority of debt holders were from other states? Yes, they could, but then they would become persona non grata for any future relations with that state or country.

Or, if there is no strong commitment, the states could simply collectively and individually decide to disown all of the federal debt. That would be a draconian move with severe economic, social, and political consequences, but still conceivable.

Who gets the gold?

Some sort of proportional divide, probably based on population makes the most sense for how to divvy up the gold held by the Federal Reserve.

Or a common monetary union could hold the gold, with proportional ownership by the states.

Or, the gold could be sold on the open market over time with the proceeds distributed to the states on a proportional basis.

Who pays social security?

Each state would certainly be free to decide if and how they wish to honor Social Security obligations.

There would be massive social unrest if they did not honor those obligations.

Some sort of proportional divide, probably based on population makes the most sense for how to divvy up the federal Social Security trust funds.

What happens if someone moves to another state after dissolution? Interesting question. I would suggest that the Social Security trust funds for an individual could be transferred to their new state.

Lots of details to resolve, but nothing fatal to the overall proposal.  
Who gets the nukes and aircraft carriers?

What would the disposition of the military forces be?

The nuclear weapons and aircraft carriers in particular. And nuclear subs as well.

A defense union, ala NATO, could be organized for common defense. Or not. At least it's a possibility.

First the easy (easier) stuff.

Bases and personnel are easy.

Bases would revert to the state in which they are located. The states can then do as they wish with them.

Personnel would stay or return to their home state, as they wish.

In theory, smaller weapons and systems, such as individual tanks, jets, and helicopters, smaller weapons, and ammunition could be distributed proportionally among the states based on population.

A lot of the smaller stuff — smaller than nukes and larger ships — can simply be auctioned to the highest bidder. States which really want equipment and systems

can pay for them, the proceeds to be distributed proportionally to the other states over time.

The nukes, aircraft carriers, larger ships, and major bombers could be auctioned as well, to the states which really want them. Again, paid for over time, with the proceeds distributed proportionally to the other states.

And if some states (blue states?) are horrified at the other states (red states?) having the nukes, bombers, aircraft carriers, or nuclear subs, they could band together to out-bid the other (red?) states, with an agreement to decommission and otherwise destroy the undesirable weapon systems. It could be very expensive to exercise that financial veto, but that would at least put a price tag on how badly they really wish to deny the other states access to those weapons systems.

This distribution would only occur if the U.S. were jointly dissolved, but would not occur to any state which voluntarily seceded by itself or was expelled from the union.

Nuclear weapon plans and plants

Besides the actual nuclear weapons themselves, two related issues are the plans and technology for producing new nuclear weapons and the weapons labs and plants around the country currently used to produce the critical components of nuclear weapons and the missiles used to deliver them. Who gets all this stuff?

A preliminary question is whether some or most states might prefer to destroy it all and assure that nobody gets it. If a few or even a majority of states want to keep and pursue this technology, then where does that leave the remaining states?

In its current configuration, nuclear weapons design and development is widely dispersed so that no single state has a critical mass to do it all itself.

It could well be that nuclear weapons become impractical for any federations of states if the U.S. is dissolved. Not necessarily, but still possible. And theoretically a

critical mass of the nuke producing states could agree on a nuclear defense federation even if they don't agree on a political federation.

I would recommend that initially a nuclear defense federation would be formed among the states, and then evolve that over time. It's probably too large an issue to deal with otherwise at the time of dissolution of the U.S.

One alternative would be a nuclear disarmament federation that manages all the nuclear matters with the goal of eventual disarmament.

In any case, the simple solution is that all states would get the plans and technology and a proportional fractional ownership of the special nuclear material, with which they could do as they wanted, such as selling to the highest bidder from the remaining states, or destroying it.

It would seem advantageous to have a joint compact among all the states to refrain from transferring any of the plans, technology, plants, equipment, or material to another country, in perpetuity, except maybe solely for the purposes of destroying it.

This distribution would only occur if the U.S. were jointly dissolved, but would not occur to any state which voluntarily seceded by itself or was expelled from the union.

Secrets and classified materials

Who gets all the federal government secrets and access to all classified materials? There might be some issues, but equal distribution among the dissolved states would seem like the presumed option.

It's also possible that the dissolved states might agree that some secrets and classified materials would better be destroyed.

There is the open issue that some states might be more inclined to make some of these matters public even as other states are more inclined to keep them secret. How to resolve such a dispute? That's an interesting question to pursue, but not a fatal flaw in this proposal.

To some extent, secrets of the old federal union would be of dubious value once the union was dissolved.

This distribution would only occur if the U.S. were jointly dissolved, but would not occur to any state which voluntarily seceded by itself or was expelled from the union.

Disposition of spy agencies

What happens to the CIA, NSA, and rest of the espionage and intelligence agencies?

Individual states and federations of states might wish to maintain them even if only on a smaller scale.

Some significant fraction or even majority of the states might opt to maintain the full intelligence community as a common intelligence union.

How much of the FBI is included in all of this is another interesting matter.

Plenty of details and issues to work out, but not fatal to this proposal.

Mutual defense

A defense union, ala NATO, could be organized for common defense. Or not. At least it's a possibility.

Regional federations of states might also form mutual defense unions.

States might ally with other countries for mutual defense as well. For example, the New England states might find common cause with Canada. Or even the UK.  
State constitutions?

Every state currently has its own constitution anyway, currently. A lot of people don't realize that.

Even so, states might wish to beef up their constitutions since citizens won't have the federal constitution to fall back on.  
Regional federations?

Although each state would be free to go its own way, the cost of doing so might be very high. Regional combinations of states would make a lot of sense — birds of a feather flocking together.

Some example regional combinations:

Midwest states.

New England.

Midatlantic states.

Pacific coast states — CA, OR, WA, possibly AK and HI.

Gulf coast states — TX, LA, MS, AL, FL — Gulf States of America?

Big blue states — CA, NY, MA, IL.

Big red states.

Little red states.

Plains states.

Rocky mountain states.

Regions could be mega sized or could simply be a couple of states.

What Alaska and Hawaii would do is an interesting question.



Who knows, maybe with global warming, Alaska could become a very substantial standalone country.

Maybe Hawaii would revert to being a small kingdom.

Plenty of possibilities, but no issues that would be fatal to this proposal.

Border issues

Right now, crossing a state border is a complete non-issue. But upon dissolution, and absent any sort of regional federation, various border issues arise:

How freely can state borders be crossed?

How will disputes about issues near borders be resolved? Actually, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) of the UN can address such matters.

Tariffs for transit of goods across state borders.

Criminal activities which cross state borders.

Adjudication of the borders themselves. ICJ again.

Regional compacts are really needed to cover almost all borders unless a state wishes to become an isolated fortress state.

Landlocked states would either have to become self-sufficient or negotiate access deals with adjoining states.

Air travel between states

Air travel between states may or may not become problematic.

Again, regional compacts could smooth over most matters. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey might be a good model, or at least point in the right direction, or be a starting point.

In principle, a continental air compact could preserve the current air transport system, although individual states or regions could decide to go their own ways.

U.S. territories?

What would happen to the U.S. territories:

Puerto Rico  
Virgin Islands  
Guam  
Etc.

That's an open question, but not a stumbling block to dissolution of the U.S.

The simple solution would be that each territory would become quasi-independent and have the right to choose to remain fully independent or ally with one of the U.S. states, or some other country for that matter.

Native Americans?

What should happen with Native Americans (so-called Indians)?

I don't have any firm proposals at this stage, other than to suggest that their reservations should probably have a right to independence, as if they were states, and then be permitted to join federations of other states as well, if they choose.

Whether newly-independent states after dissolution of the U.S. would have or feel that they have any obligation to Native Americans and any previous treaty obligations of a now-dissolved U.S. is an interesting question. Whether each state would have a Bureau of Indian Affairs is an open question as well.

Again, I don't have solid answers or positions here. This is primarily a placeholder and opportunity for additional thought experiments.

Should some of the larger states be split as well?

Although this proposal does not directly address the question, there is the matter of whether some of the larger states should be split apart as well. Not forcefully, but it may make more sense from an ideological perspective.

For example, California and New York. There are at least a few bastions of conservatism in California even if most of the state is much more liberal. Similarly, New York City is rather different from upstate New York state.

Again, I wouldn't propose forcing a division of such states, but it would be a good opportunity, especially if ideological divides are the reason to dissolve the U.S. in the first place.

What about immigration between states?

People can now freely move between states. That would not be the case if the U.S. were dissolved. It would be up to each state to decide its own immigration policies.

Some states may opt for a relatively open border policy, permitted citizens of the former U.S. to move freely between states.

What would the rules be for statehood after dissolution?

I would imagine that each state would adopt similar provisions for statehood or quasi-sovereign regions within states after dissolution as are in the federal constitution currently, plus my proposed changes.

Counties within states would be the equivalent of states in the union.

What about enclaves within states?

The constitution currently prohibits creation of enclave states:

but no new States shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State;

I'm not sure what that was all about in the first place.

Maybe it had some merit back in 1787.

From where I sit now, I see no reason to continue that restriction.

Although, it wouldn't make sense to have a lot of very tiny states forming within states, like individual cities or even small towns. Sounds like the old European concept of principalities such as San Marino and Andorra. But, if that's what people really want, I see no reason to forbid it.

As things stand today, it would be up to the current states to allow such a prospect, which they would probably have no interest in unless there was some special circumstance.

What about the urban/rural split within states?

In some states, such as New York and California, there may be urban areas that are so radically different from more rural areas from both a practical and ideological perspective that the dissolution of the federal government still doesn't address some of the critical social and political divides. What then? There may be additional solutions, but two I imagine would have some appeal are:

Large urban areas might secede on their own from their enclosing state.

Migration of radical ideologists to another state that is more friendly towards their ideology.

In any case, this issue is not fatal to this proposal.

The House is too big and too unrepresentative

The House of Representatives was supposed to be the primary way that average citizens are represented in their government, but that role seems under great stress these days.

One problem is that there are simply too many representatives, so that none of them can truly establish and exploit the kinds of interpersonal relationships needed for great legislating. There are simply too many competing interests and it's too difficult to really resolve almost anything. The result is less than sterling laws.

A more effective House would have far fewer representatives. Maybe no more than 200 or 150 or even 100.

The bigger problem than the unmanageable size of the House is that each Representative represent way too many citizens in way too many disparate locales, so that the literal, intellectual, and civic distance between a Representative and an average citizen or even an average locale is way too great. Too unrepresentative.

In theory, we should have more representatives as the population grows, but back in 1913 Congress recognized that the House was already too big and unwieldy and fixed the number of representatives, causing the citizen to representative ratio to balloon, so that today it is roughly 700,000, which is more like the mayor of a moderate size city rather than a precinct or district that representatives should be. The original U.S. Constitution set the ratio at 30,000.

You could argue that modern transportation and modern media make it easier for Representatives to communicate to their constituents, but I would argue that that is one way, and that modern media has so many problems and conflicts of interest that its value for the kind of communication and relationship between a Representative and their constituents is greatly diminished and quite tarnished.

The solution? There is none! The obvious fact is that the U.S. is now too big to have effective representative government. It is now literally not possible.

The only real solution to this representation problem is this proposal for dissolution, so that each new country can have a House of Representatives where average citizens can feel that they have a personal connection to their representative.

## Interstate commerce

Interstate commerce is no big deal today, but the prospect of real borders between states makes a non-issue a significant issue.

Regional trade compacts can certainly address this. Most states will be more than eager to export their own products and services and import products and services that they need.

I would propose that part of the package of dissolution of the U.S. would be a trade compact that covers all 50 states, or at least as many states that want to continue interstate commerce, at least as a starting point.

Over time, individual states, pairs of states, or clusters of states might decide that they have particular trade interests that are not addressed by a super-compact, and opt to pursue more limited or focused trade compacts.

Yes, there is plenty to be worked out here, and plenty of room for conflict, but this area is still not fatal to this proposal.

## National companies

What happens with big companies that operate nationwide or even regionally or even across a single border?

Interstate commerce trade pacts might address many or most of the issues, but probably not all.

I don't have a list of issues in this area right now, just the notion that it would be an important area.

Multinational companies would be the default model for what should happen to nationwide companies after dissolution.

That said, multinational business, although quite successful, has lots of issues and outright problems, that we shouldn't want to inflict on a company simply because they do business in more than one state.

In any case, this shouldn't be fatal to this proposal.

U.S. role as a superpower

One significant impact of dissolving the U.S. is that the U.S. would no longer be a superpower.

To some, that would be a very bad thing, but to others that would be a very good thing. Yet another one of the divides in America.

Technically, all or most or many of the states of a dissolved U.S. could have a mutual defense pact such that collectively they would still be a superpower of sorts.

It's a complex issue, but not fatal to this proposal, unless you are a diehard supporter of the concept of the U.S. as a superpower.

U.S. as the indispensable nation

Some view the U.S. as the indispensable nation. Not so much because of being a military superpower, but the combination of being the moral leader of the free world plus having the resources to back it up and come to the rescue in all manner of difficulties.

Dissolution of the U.S. would eliminate this appellation, although, again, some, many, or most of the states could form a compact that had a lot of the positive effects that the U.S. formerly had as the indispensable nation.

Role in NATO

What would NATO even mean after dissolution of the U.S.?

The current conception of NATO is primarily that the U.S. would rush to the rescue in the case of an existential threat to Europe.

But with a dissolved U.S., there would no longer be a single, large, monolithic U.S. military and political powerhouse to rush into anything.

Without the U.S. as primary rescuer, NATO is essentially toothless. NATO is primarily about the U.S.

That said, once again, some, many, or most of the states could form a mutual defense compact which could still play a role in NATO similar to that of the U.S. today.

The big question is whether or how many of the states would actually want to continue playing such a role in European affairs.

NATO made a lot of sense immediately after World War II when France and Germany were very weak and the European Union was nonexistent. But with Europe now an economic powerhouse in its own right, and having significant military forces in many countries, it is very unclear what role is essential from our side of the Atlantic.

At a minimum, we should revisit our essential role in European affairs regardless of whether this proposal is pursued.

What do the kids want?

Personally, I'd prefer to leave it to the next generation. They may have radically different ideas for how to organize society than their parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents.

Maybe it would be best for us to simply limp along through the next ten, fifteen, or even twenty years, so that we have had a chance for one, two, three, or even four waves of fresh political and social leaders to give the union a shot, and then let the



kids, then at least beginning to enter the ranks of leadership, but without decades invested in the status quo, decide whether to pull the plug on the union.

Give the union another 20 years

That's my final, best offer. If the vast majority of average citizens are even half as profoundly disenchanted with our system of government in 20 years, there will simply be no good reason not to bail out and dissolve the United States and ditch the Constitution.

And then start over to seek a more perfect union.

Should the colonies have formed two separate unions?

Even at the time of the American Revolution and before the U.S. Constitution was set in stone there were significant divisions among the colonies. That's why we ended up with the Articles of Confederation, why the Articles failed, why there was so much debate over the Constitution, why the Bill of Rights was separate, why we had the Civil War, and why divisions persisted right up through today.

Might it simply have been a whole lot better for the thirteen colonies to have formed two separate but cooperating unions, a union of northern states and a union of southern states?

Two separate, independent countries, each with its own constitution and values?

Two countries, each with citizens who had deeper shared values that they have had together?

Separate, but each more cohesive than they have been together?

Possibly, but so difficult to say for sure.

Would two separate unions have been able to survive against the British in the War of 1812? Maybe, maybe not, or possibly they might have survived even better or even deterred the British from even attacking.

Might the Civil War have been avoided?

But would slavery have persisted and thrived in the southern union of states?

Or might slavery have eventually died off due to the evolving economics of labor anyway, avoiding conflict between the northern and southern states?

I'll leave these as open questions, another thought experiment to ponder.

In any case, we are stuck with decisions made in 1776, 1787, 1860, and 1865, but we do have our own independent decisions to make today and in the coming years and decades.

We should think more carefully, deeply, and broadly than we have in the past.  
What else?

What issues have I not addressed or maybe not even identified?  
What's next?

Nothing is next. Just sit back and watch the drama play out.

See if it dissipates and harmony returns within three to ten years. Can we sense a rough trend back to some sense of normalcy?

Or see if the disharmony only accelerates and spirals downwards even more viciously and out of control.

The beauty of the system is that every two and four years we have a great opportunity to take stock and get instant feedback as to how we're doing.

Novel or movie?

This proposal could be evaluated more readily if put into the form of a novel or even a movie. Something people can relate to.

Or maybe a series, with different scenarios played out, the good, the bad, the great, and the ugly.

Work in progress

This proposal is not considered complete and comprehensive. It is everything that I have thought of, so far, but ideas will likely continue to pop up, so I expect this will be a living document.

Or, maybe at some stage it peters out or becomes irrelevant and is finally relegated to the proverbial dustbin of history.

Conclusion

There is no conclusion per se, yet, except that we should definitely raise the question as to whether the United States is headed on a path towards a more perfect union, or whether it is time or will soon be time to abandon this particular union in favor of more stable, tenable, and promising unions.

Again, this is merely a proposal for a thought experiment and discussion, not a firm proposal for immediate action.

At a minimum it would be good for the proponents of preserving the union to at least attempt to produce the proposed Declaration of Dependence document to allow people to publicly commit to whatever it is they believe the union still represents. I suspect that such an effort would fail, if not because no document of shared values could be produced, then because competing sociopolitical factions would produce distinct and hopelessly conflicting documents. That, or produce a

document that is so vague and ambiguous that it merely papers over the irreconcilable conflicts.

## **Scenario 5:**

Solomon Abrams

California, continually being governed by Republicans in Washington, decides to leave the US. Texas, with its gerrymandered Republican majority, decides it would have better border security without those pesky liberal courts, and it secedes too. New York, much like California, sees that it has little in common with most of the other states, leaves the Union. Does Washington send in the army and force these states to stay in the Union like Lincoln did in the 1860's, or is the rest of the country fine with the three largest, most economically important states in the Union leaving? If a new civil war breaks out, states like Washington and Oregon would probably defend California against Unionist forces, while Louisiana and Oklahoma start fighting for Texas, and all of New England fights along side New York. Then you have chaos. Other states may see the writing on the wall and leave the Union too. Hawaii and Alaska would hardly be missed. States of the former Confederacy, like North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia could form a new CSA since at this point, the United States is a dumpster fire. Florida wouldn't want to be part of the new CSA, so maybe they just become a sovereign neutral state. The upper and lower Midwest would stay with the US, somebody has to.

Economic collapse, another financial crisis hits, China's economy stop growing. And they refuse paying America more money. Europe get in similar situation, and can likewise not pay more to US debt, what even worse is investor that start demanding their money bag, from US debt.

The US will be forced to take more loans from their own banks, to cover the costs and to keep their own government running.

which will mean a increase of the dollar value in the short period, before it start plummeting to rock bottom.

As they are met with unpaid costs, US treasury is forced to print more money.  
As the US congress struggle to cut down on cost, while fighting a internal struggle against each other, and become unable to act.

In a short time US will get in a worse crisis than the great depression. The banks will start closing, companies will close down, unemployment will rise with the crime rate. Savings get wiped out.

Riots in street, as 40 % of the country population will probably end up homeless. The US government will be unable to hold itself together, as it no longer is able to pay for anything, the army personnel get laid off in large numbers. And militias start getting active, as independent movement for some of the wealthy states gain momentum.

The US will have to declare bankruptcy, to cut off some of its debt, which may start wars, with several bonds holders. And a need sell its colonies in the Pacific Ocean, sell off all its reserve (gold, oil, etc.).

everything will stop working, gas stations, hospitals, schools even roads, Electricity and water will be cut off.

Some states will gain independence at this point, because there nothing left to hold them in place.

Groups of crooks will plunder the countryside, as gangs take control of the cities.

**Scenario 100:**

I am concerned about the huge debt the USA now has and believe it could lead to the kind of problems currently being experienced by Greece. I suppose this could lead to an end to the USA but my best guess is that won't happen. Instead there might be a large change in the activities of the USA such as actually following the constitution that forbids most of the activities of the federal government that started with Roosevelt and the "New deal".

## **Scenario 9001**

Larry Danson

### **The United States Must Dissolve, If America Is To Survive**

When one speaks of the “United States,” one actually means the American governmental-military complex. And when one speaks of “America,” one can only mean the American landscape (or country) and the diverse ethnicities which populate the land from coast to coast. When one makes reference to the “American people” (a common mistake in political speeches), one is referring to something that has never existed. There is no such thing as the American people – only a diverse plethora of peoples who happen to live under the same national banner and who are all subject to the same federal laws. So in fact, when politicians, pundits, professors and others use the expression “the American people,” they do so erroneously. Again, a singular American ethnos has never existed – unless of course one considers the American Indians, who are the only “Americans” that have a justifiable historical claim to the entire North American continent.

Nevertheless, a rigorous ongoing process of non-Native colonization has been underway for the past four centuries. The colonizers themselves have come from every habitable country on the planet. I cannot in good conscience refer to them as either “immigrants” or “settlers” simply because the land they colonized (and continue to colonize) happens to be stolen property, taken from the American Indians (or Natives) by force of arms. Of course the great majority of the colonizers came from Europe. This majority was collectively responsible for perpetrating three great evils: (1) the mass genocide of the Native population, (2) the enslavement of tens of millions of Africans, and (3) the creation of an ideological Beast called “Americanism.” It is the latter of the three evils which is the main topic of this essay.

First of all, the reader must understand Americanism is and always has been inseparably tied to the plutocratic U.S. system of liberal democracy and the brazen



rule of money. Americanism has never cared a damn about the “vast unwashed masses” of its citizenry, which is to say the laboring classes and the working poor. On the contrary, Americanism has only concerned itself with their continual exploitation, alongside the exploitation of every foreign and non-white population with which the U.S. government has come into contact.

To put it another way: Americanism is the hypocritical and fundamentally liberal worldview which accurately represents a system founded on the poisonous principles of Freemasonry (i.e. liberalism and hyper-individualism) and ruled by the money-grubbing mitts of International Finance. This exploitative system was neither born in 1913 with the founding of the Federal Reserve nor in 1865 with the capitulation of the Confederacy – such arguments are spurious pieces of disinformation propagated by those whose ancestors absolutely reveled in the oppression and genocide of non-whites and foreigners.

In all honesty the exploitation began in the early 17th century and was finally codified into law with the founding of the artificial union of English-speaking commercial enterprises known as the “United States of America.” In other words, the ideological basis of white supremacy in North America was founded right alongside the liberal republic itself. The name of this maniacal ideology is: “Americanism.” The process of cultural and biological genocide it submits its unfortunate victims to is called “Americanization.” Therefore “Americanism,” “Americanization,” and the vast universe of decadence which these words represent and spawn, ought to be despised by every peace-loving human being everywhere.

And so, the very first thing that must be done is to pursue, by whatever means, the complete and total collapse of the artificial District of Columbia Empire known as the “United States.” This is a fundamental prerequisite if the human race is to survive on the North American continent and globally. From the time of the trans-Atlantic slave trade and the Indian wars, to the U.S.’s ongoing genocide of Arabs and Afghanis, to the endless police brutality committed everyday against the working-poor and people of color, the United States government has only

recognized one cardinal rule: might makes right – the primary mindset of all criminals and aggressor regimes.

In consideration of the above, the U.S. citizenry must eventually come to the realization (hopefully sooner rather than later) that no amount of voting through the duopolistic liberal democratic system is going to ameliorate or reverse the current status quo. Just as Greek and Turkish patriots alike sought the demise of the totally corrupted Ottoman Empire a century ago, so must all true American nationalists look to cast off the yoke of the U.S. Federal Government and its increasingly militarized system of state-sponsored intimidation and violence. This is neither a Democratic nor Republican issue; this is an issue of basic survival.

To think like many U.S. “conservatives” – who still do not comprehend that there is nothing in the U.S. system worth conserving – is the absolute zenith of stupidity. Such conservatives, who wish to somehow turn back the clock constitutionally while ignoring the fact that the Constitution ceased being a relevant document long, long ago, must be counted among the ranks of our enemies. Who could logically dispute the fact that in this system of legalized bribery the Pro-War and Christian Zionist lobbies are strongest in conservative, dare I say constitutionalist, circles? These “conservative” useful idiots do the bidding of their Wall Street masters while they surreptitiously assist in the further corporeal desecration of the same Dead Document (the same liberal idol) they clamor so vehemently to support. There can be no greater example of sublime irony!

Ultimately, however, we must understand the broader significance and implications of the conservative chicanery, as these willing accomplices (indeed, hired hitmen) of International Finance condemn an entire species to certain extinction for the temporary satisfaction of collecting their 40 shekels of silver. Have no illusions, you “constitutionalists” reading this – you who believe the U.S. Constitution is an end in itself! Your sacred text was flawed from the very beginning – and it finally died as a result of the same fatal Disease which its slave-holding authors originally spawned: GREED.

Indeed, it was the framers of the U.S. Constitution who, guided by their Enlightenment era “wisdom,” provided the blueprint for a Government which is tailor-made for the total plutocratic corruption of the political process. Whether or not the framers were cognizant of this is immaterial. This is where the Freemasons come into the equation.

In addition to his unequalled prowess as a master deceiver, the Freemason is also a Materialist. In fact he is a hyper-Materialist. Likewise, U.S. society is but a hyper-Materialist expression of liberal Freemasonic domination, a society reflecting the values of its Freemason overlords – one of total egoism and self-deceptive amusement, of endless themes yet no substance. Hence all the “theme” and “amusement” parks of immediate gratification and the endless shopping malls of consumerism where everything is viewed as “merchandise.”

In this dystopian Shylock society: flesh is a commodity, death is an industry, and human misery is a stock to be traded on the exchange like everything else. Suffering is both the true U.S. currency and the highest cause of the State – it is the *raison d’etre* of State power.

Hence the prison industry, the criminal injustice system, the federal war for drugs, the War on Terra (i.e. Earth), government sponsored perversion in its support for homosexual rights, the Israeli child-porn and prostitution rings, etc., etc. Once people wise up to the Great American Charade, they will come to the inevitable conclusion that the present U.S. system is in fact the most evil system that has ever plagued the peoples of the earth. They will come to the further realization that all of the above-mentioned ills (increasing criminalization, endless wars, the homosexual agenda, child exploitation, etc.) are inevitable precisely because they are supported by that infamous Document of Death – the Nosferatu of all political treatises: the U.S. Constitution.

Indeed, this liberal paper idol is buried deep inside the realm of the dead. And its foul stinking Mausoleum (the U.S. Government) stands brazen with its artificial

system of subsidiary “states” which are nothing of the sort, but only localized tentacles of the overarching Federal and Global Capitalist tyranny.

Clamor all you want, you poor misguided U.S. “patriots,” about your “blessed” Declaration and your “sacred” Bill of Rights! But in reality, you have no rights. You have no actual freedom of speech – consider, for example, the cases of Edward Snowden and Joy Powell. Likewise, your right to bear arms was buried alongside 80 Branch Davidians murdered by federal storm-troopers in the infamous Waco siege. Some might even say the Second Amendment was buried with Robert E. Lee. And if you actually believe that the police are your “friends,” perhaps the good people of Ferguson, Missouri might like to have a word with you. As for your “freedom of the press,” this means nothing but freedom for the richest one-percent to increase their riches by continually propagating decadence and treason. As for “trial by jury,” it does not exist for those who exercise their “right” to “pursue happiness” or the lifestyle they choose to lead. Just ask Randy Weaver – a law-abiding U.S. citizen who saw his wife, 14-year-old son and loyal canine shot dead by an army of federal agents who, for political reasons, descended upon his home at Ruby Ridge.

I, the author, can cite many more examples of blatant U.S. tyranny, but for the sake of time, space and staying true to the topic of this essay, I will cease. For now, it suffices to say that all of the rights a U.S. citizen might think he or she possesses are nothing more than an illusion, a myth, a deliberate con – or better, a Constitution.

Thus, it is absolutely crucial that patriotic North Americans fight for the collapse of the genocidal anti-human entity known as the United States. The collapse of this system is the fundamental first step in freeing all human beings worldwide; as it was in the last days of the morally bankrupt Roman Empire, so it is today. When the plug is finally pulled on DC and Wall Street, so also will the lingering NATO and EU puppet shows come to an abrupt end. To believe (as many Western European right-wingers do) that a vacillating coalition of European civic nationalist parties in Brussels will somehow cast off the yoke of U.S. imperialism

is the summit of political naiveté, as Brussels is itself a well-entrenched subsidiary organ of said imperialism.

Worse yet is the prevailing notion among many “White Nationalists” that an increasingly militarized and ethnic chauvinist United States (or Western Europe) will somehow swoop in to save the West from any further decadence. These folks paradoxically subscribe to a set of liberally-derived racist principles which they believe will somehow save themselves from the same liberally-derived decadence which permeates their society. Their thinking is nothing less than delusional!

Indeed, many are so fanatically racist that they are blind to what must be done – oblivious to the fact that salvation does not lie in hating other races, but rather in destroying the governmental-military complex which controls their very lives. They lose sight of the fact that it is the United States that must be slain like the fire-breathing dragon it most certainly is. And that can only be accomplished (short of a global apocalypse) from the inside with the assistance of a Global Revolutionary Alliance – one which represents all anti-U.S. forces on both the Left and the Right, and which includes revolutionaries of all races, nationalities, tongues and tribes; a Global Revolutionary alliance which is well versed in the ways of 21st warfare – from cyber-attacks to political and economic sabotage, to real-world military operations.

Thus, all anti-liberals and anti-U.S. nationalists – regardless of race, culture and political orientation – are the natural enemies of the United States as well as the natural allies of the North American anti-Globalist resistance. Be they Black Panthers, Aztlán militants, Southern secessionists or whomever – all those who seek the demise of the United States Government are our comrades in arms. Our chief enemies: the political class, Big Business, the various pro-Globalist lobbies, the U.S. military, and the federal, state and local police agencies which act as the armed muscle – the mafia hitmen (as it were) – for the first three groups.

Finally then, upon the USA’s collapse, a natural realignment of North American regions will occur, wherein the regions will have much greater control over their

own destinies – not only in trade and commerce, but also in the realms of politics, culture, education, medicine, civil and administrative law, and more freedom still.

Once the three-pronged power grip of the Pentagon, Wall Street and Hollywood (the military/political-economic-cultural nerve centers of “USA-dom”) are smashed, a series of organic regional states will emerge based on culture, ethnicity and geographic attachment. These states will then naturally join the new multipolar world order championed first and foremost by the burgeoning Eurasian Union. The new ethno-cultural-geopolitical alignment on the North American continent will set an example for all nations to follow.

Thus shall the dissolution of the USA be heralded as a New Beginning in song and saga. And thus shall the birth of a true multipolar world order usher in the long awaited Cosmic Dawn of the human species.

## **Scenario number Samson Option:**

The Dissolution of the United States of America is a major historical event that occurred in the early 21st century when the USA fell. It is one of the key distinguishing events of the Post-Dissolution Sphere, an out of character term to refer to roleplayers who follow or recognize this event as well as several other factors. The former superpower was soon succeeded by several nations which claimed sovereignty over all or parts of the former lands of the USA. Generally, most of these "successors" have overlapping areas which often lead to disputes. The decline in power of the United States of America started in 2004, and it completely dissolved by the year 2006.

### Factors

There were many factors that played a role on the decay of the United States of America:

- Economic recession/depression
- Military competition
- Internal unrest
- Too many people to rule over
- Opposition from non-Westerners
- Disease epidemics
- Secessions of various non-recognized states
- Loss of allies as they also dissolved
- Lack of national will

### Successors

Feel free to add your nation if it is part or entirely part of the former lands of the United States of America.

United States of JBR

Union of Midway Status is disputed as the Union of Midway only controls Midway Atoll.

They only claim sovereignty over the Midway Atoll.

Frankmerica

Bermuda Union

Central Kingdom

Californian Union

Kern

Louisiana Federation

Deltoran Republic

Portlandia

Bowasia

Tidewater (The People's Republic of Tidewater)

## Causes

The causes that led to the dissolution of the USA remain controversial among scholars, although most agree that the economic crisis, ongoing wars, and subsequent widespread riots led to the collapse of the American government. Because of this, many cities became city-states that often fought with each other. Over the course of time, some city-states united as reconstituted states. Several countries claimed to be the complete leader over the entire USA, while others were restricted to smaller regions. Despite these disputes, nearly all of these nation-states are now living peacefully with each other. This constantly confuses the peoples of overlapping nations, however—as they don't know who to serve or conquer.

## Unification of former USA

Although the complete re-unification of the USA has been proposed or attempted, no country has successfully conquered all of the former lands of USA. Because of this, many will claim all of the land without any actual attempt to unify all of the



territories because of the fear of war, and lack of support from the people and leaders.

### Solution to Unification

As proposed by several scholars and cartographers, sovereign states that existed and claimed a particular land first would have the right to claim all such lands. However, this may not be the case when a younger nation may have a better stance in terms of settlement and military occupation, and could also be supported by other nations. Although the true way to identify which country is the true "sovereign state" remains under debate, many countries create "factbooks" to make themselves better known to others (doing this also allows others to support that country over lesser-known ones).



Copyright © 2019 by Daniel Sperling